UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/830,226	04/23/2001	Paul Aubrey Greenfield	09/100.000	3270

7590 02/23/2006

Mark T Starr
Unisys Corporation
Unisys Way MS E8 114
Blue Bell, PA 19424

EXAMINER	
CAO, DIEM K	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2194	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/830,226	GREENFIELD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Diem K. Cao	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 October 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/23/2001
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-40 are pending. Applicant has amended claims 1, 14, 27 and 28.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 26 recites the limitation "said terminal screen definitions" in page 25. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7, 10-20, 23-26, 27-34 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phanouriou et al. (Transforming Command-Line Driven Systems to Web Applications) in view of Eager et al. (U.S. 5,969,200).

5. As to claim 1, Phanouriou teaches a method for adapting a legacy software application (Idrag program; page 2 and abstract), created from legacy source code and developed for an environment comprising a centralized computing resource interconnected to a series of computer

terminal devices (Unix computers; page 2), to a network environment (Web; page 2), wherein the network environment comprises a system of distributed, interconnected network computing resources (computers have access to Internet; page 2 and abstract), the method comprising the steps of utilizing the legacy code to produce a series of executable software components (Interface server; page 4 and Interface client generates the GUI from an application description; page 6) that provide the functionality for interaction with the legacy software application (anyone can visit a Web page ... When a user visits a Web page ... visualization and further analysis; page 2 and Figs. A, B, C), the components being executable by at least one of the computing resources in the network environment (The HTTP server returns an applet that is the Javamatic interface client; page 5 and Fig. 3), and wherein upon execution, the computing resource is caused to interconnect with the legacy software application over the network so as to interact with the legacy software application in the transmission or receipt of information to and from the legacy software application (Fig. 3 and associated text; pages 5-6).

6. However, Phanouriou does not explicitly teach providing a software application which utilizes the legacy source code to automatically produce a series of executable software components that provide the functionality for interaction with the legacy software application. Eager teaches providing a software application which utilizes the legacy source code to automatically produce a series of executable software components that provide the functionality for interaction with the legacy software application (An automated transitions an entire enterprise to a distributed infrastructure; abstract and Information stored in the user interface ... structures 118; col. 23, lines 35-45 and col. 9, lines 45-65).

7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Phanouriou and Eager because Eager's system provides a method to transitions an entire enterprise to a distributed infrastructure.

8. As to claim 2, Eager teaches the legacy software application includes interface specification definitions which include definitions of screen formats (Information stored in the user interface ... structures 118; col. 23, lines 35-45), the step of producing the series of software components further comprising generating a series of user interface software components from the screen format definitions (Information stored in the user interface ... structures 118; col. 23, lines 35-45 and col. 9, lines 45-65), the user interface software components being arranged for execution on the network computer resource to provide a graphical user interface providing at least data entry and display facilities of the interface specification definitions (Fig. 4 and associated text and col. 33, lines 20-30 and 42-43).

9. As to claim 3, Phanouriou as modified teaches the interface software components are arranged to generate forms corresponding to forms generated by the legacy software application (Figs. A, B, C and page 2).

10. As to claim 4, Phanouriou teaches the client interface components being arranged to interact over the network with the legacy software application (Fig. 3 and associated text; pages 5-6).

11. As to claim 5, Phanouriou teaches the client interface components include a user input object which is arranged to receive data input by a user of the network computing resource and transmit data to the legacy application, over the network (Figs. A, B, C, 3 and associated text).

12. As to claim 6, Phanouriou teaches the series of software components are loadable and executable by an Internet Browser (The HTTP server returns an applet; page 5).

13. As to claim 7, Phanouriou teaches the series of software components comprise Java code applet (applet; page 5 and Interface Client; page 6).

14. As to claim 10, Phanouriou teaches the network environment comprises the Internet network (Web page, URL; page 2).

15. As to claim 11, Eager teaches the network environment utilizes TCP/IP transfer protocols (TCP/IP; col. 22, lines 30-43).

16. As to claim 12, Phanouriou does not teach the source code is written in a 4GL language. Phanouriou teaches the legacy application in general and can be applied to multiple type of applications. It would have been obvious the legacy system of Phanouriou could also include the 4GL application.

17. As to claim 13, Phanouriou does not teach the source code is written in a LINC language. Phanouriou teaches the legacy application in general and can be applied to multiple types of applications. It would have been obvious the legacy system of Phanouriou could also include the LINC application.

18. As to claims 14 and 28, they correspond to the method claim of claim 1 except they are computer product and system claims, respectively.

19. As to claims 15-20, see rejections of claims 2-7 above.

20. As to claims 23-24, see rejections of claims 10-11 above.

21. As to claim 25, see rejection of claim 13 above.

22. As to claim 26, Eager teaches the terminal screen definitions are written in a screen control language (col. 30, lines 45-53).

23. As to claims 28-34, see rejections of claims 2-7 above.

24. As to claims 37-40, see rejections of claims 10-13 above.

25. As to claim 27, see rejection of claims 1 and 12 above. Eager further teaches template definitions (Information stored in the user interface ... structures 118; col. 23, lines 35-45).

26. Claims 8, 21, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phanouriou et al. (Transforming Command-Line Driven Systems to Web Applications) in view of Eager et al. (U.S. 5,969,200) further in view of Apte et al. (U.s. 6,662,236 B1).

27. As to claim 8, Phanouriou and Eager do not teach the series of software components are executable by scripting language running on the network computing resource. Apte teaches the series of software components are executable by scripting language running on the network computing resource (JavaScript complements Java ... of an applet; col. 2, lines 38-48 and Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Phanouriou, Eager and Apte to the system of Phanouriou because it can expose useful properties of Java applets.

28. As to claims 21 and 35, see rejections of claim 8 above.

29. Claims 9, 22, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phanouriou et al. (Transforming Command-Line Driven Systems to Web Applications) in view of Eager et al. (U.S. 5,969,200) further in view of Harold (Using Component Methods in an Applet).

30. As to claim 9, Phanouriou and Eager do not teach the translatable source code includes a series of data fields and object oriented methods for setting or obtaining values of the series of data fields. Harold teaches the translatable source code includes a series of data fields and object-oriented methods for setting or obtaining values of the series of data fields (Since applets are subclass of ... paint () method; page 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Phanouriou, Eager and Harold because it provides a method to obtain and setting value for object written in Java language.

31. As to claims 22 and 36, see rejections of claim 9 above.

Response to Arguments

32. Applicant's arguments filed 10/10/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that (1) Phanouriou does not teach providing a software application which utilizes the legacy source code to automatically produce a series of executable software components, (2) Eagar does not teach a system which receives legacy source relating to the legacy application and utilizing the legacy source code to produce a series of executable software components which provide functionality for interacting with the legacy application. Eager teaches away from the instant application because it is concerned with transitioning an entire enterprise, i.e., both the back end and the front end, and (3) it is improper

to combine a second reference with a first reference if there is no indication in the first reference that such technology from the second reference would be desirable.

Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's arguments:

- As to the point (1), the limitation is newly amended and is taught by Eager (see rejection of claim 1 above.)
- As to the point (2), examiner would like to express that the limitations of the claim is rejected as the combination of Phanouriou and Eager, not Phanouriou nor Eager alone. Since Phanouriou already teaches utilizing the legacy source code to provide multiple executable software components, the only different of the Phanouriou's teaching and the instant application is using *an application to automatically* provide multiple executable software components, *not from a programmer as taught by Phanouriou*. Eager teaches an automated system that can provide multiple executable components from the legacy source code (An automated transitions an entire enterprise to a distributed infrastructure; abstract and Information stored in the user interface ... structures 118; col. 23, lines 35-45 and col. 9, lines 45-65). One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to apply the teaching of Eager to the system of Phanouriou, by having an application to do the transition instead of manually by programmers, which would reduce the time and efforts by human.
- As to the point (3), examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments. The cited law cases by the applicant's cite "Before the PTO may ..., *there must be some suggestion for doing so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge*

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art", there is not such cited that the first reference has to indicate the technology from the second reference as argued by the Applicant. Thus, the arguments are not persuasive.

Conclusion

33. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K. Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-3760. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 5:30AM - 2:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist at 571-272-2100.

Diem Cao

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER